

1 KEVIN RYAN (CSBN 118321)
2 United States Attorney

3 EUMI L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722)
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 DEREK R. OWENS (CASBN 230237)
6 Special Assistant United States Attorney

7 DRIA FEARN
8 Law Clerk

9 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor
10 San Francisco, California 94102
11 Telephone: (415) 436-6488
12 Fax: (415) 436-7234
13 Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR No.: 05-00726 MAG
17)
18 Plaintiff,) STIPULATION AND
19) PROPOSED ORDER EXCLUDING
20 v.) TIME
21 KHAHILIAH THYJUAN JACKSON,)
22 Defendant.)

23 On January 27, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that
24 time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from January 27, 2006 to
25 February 10, 2006 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required adequate
26 time for effective assistance of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the
27 continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel,
28 taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The

1 parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the
2 best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

3 SO STIPULATED:

4 KEVIN V. RYAN
5 United States Attorney

6 DATED: 2/2/06

7 /s/ Dria Fearn
8 DRIA FEARN
9 Law Clerk

10 DATED: 2/1/06

11 /s/ Elizabeth M. Falk
12 ELIZABETH M. FALK
13 Attorney for Ms. Jackson

14 As the Court found on January 27, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds
15 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and
16 the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act
17 calculations from January 27, 2006 to February 10, 2006 for effective preparation of defense
18 counsel and the United States. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the
19 requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation
20 and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
21 miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

22 SO ORDERED.

23 DATED: 3/15/06

24 
25 JOSEPH C. SPERO
26 United States Magistrate Judge
27
28